

#### REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on March 15, 2006, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire June 15, 2006. A three-month extension, extending the period of response to September 15, 2006, is submitted in a petition filed herewith.

#### Specification

The specification is amended to reflect the Petition To Claim Benefit Under 35 USC 119(e) filed herewith in which the present application claims benefit of prior filed co-owned U.S. Application Serial No. 10/002,652, filed October 19, 2001, entitled "Method and System for Providing a Modularized Server on Board" (herein Chen '652), and to incorporate the application by reference in its entirety. No new matter is entered.

#### Claims

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-24 are provisionally rejected under double patenting, and Claims 1-24 are also rejected under 35 USC as being unpatentable over the references listed below.

In the present paper, Claims 1-24 are canceled and Claims 25-42 are entered. No new matter is entered.

#### Response to Double Patenting Rejections

Applicant believes new Claims 25-42 avoid the double patenting rejections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections Over Kamper and Ban

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kamper PN 6,654,797 in view of Ban PN 6,148,354.

Claim 1 is canceled, and Claims 25-42 are newly entered.

Newly entered independent Claim 25 recites (in pertinent part) "an electronic data flash device ... including ... one or more manual control buttons", and newly entered Claim 39 similarly recites "an Universal Serial Bus (USB) device including ... one or more control buttons", and both Claims 25 and 39 recite "means for controlling the processor of the computing device in response to actuation of the one or more control buttons." In view of this claim language, Claims 25 and 39 are believed to be distinguished over Kamper and Ban in that neither of these references teach or suggest the "control buttons" and associated control means that are recited in Claims 25 and 39.

In addition, newly entered independent Claim 35 recites (in pertinent part) "an electronic data flash device ... including ... one or more display devices", and newly entered Claim 39 similarly recites "an Universal Serial Bus (USB) device including ... one or more display devices", and both Claims 25 and 39 recite "means for transmitting status information from the computing device to the electronic data flash device and for controlling said one or more display devices in accordance with the transmitted status information." In view of this claim language, Claims 35 and 39 are believed to be distinguished over Kamper and Ban in that neither of these references teach or suggest the "display devices" and associated control means that are recited in Claims 25 and 39.

Claims 26-34 are dependent from Claim 25, and are believed to be distinguished over Kamper and Ban for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 25.

Claims 36-38 are dependent from Claim 35, and are believed to be distinguished over Kamper and Ban for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 35.

Claims 40-42 are dependent from Claim 39, and are believed to be distinguished over Kamper and Ban for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 39.

Response to Rejections Over Garnett, Ban, Kim and Ivan

Claims 1, 3-4, 10, 12, 14-15, 21 and 23 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Garnett PN 6,861,614 in view of Ban.

In addition, Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13, 16-20, 22 and 24 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Garnett in view of Ban and Kim PN 6,665,383 and Ivan PN 6,832,271.


In response to the above listed rejections, in view of the Petition To Claim Benefit Under 35 USC 119(e) filed herewith, Applicant respectfully submits that Garnett, Kim and Ivan are not proper prior art references. Chen '652, from which the present application now claims priority, has a filing date of October 19, 2001. Each of the Garnett, Kim and Ivan has a filing date that is after October 19, 2001. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on these references.

For the above reasons, Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 103.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicants believe Claims 25-42 to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 22888

Patrick T. Bever  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,834  
408-451-5902